

# **Interview Summary**

Application No.

09/625,006

Applicant(s)

HERZBERG ET AL.

Examiner

Kambiz Abdi

Art Unit

3621

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kambiz Abdi (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Sanford T. Colb (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 21 July 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: U.S. Patent No. 6,157,917 To Barber.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant's representative attorney Colb explained the inventive steps that are claimed in claim 1. Further the attorney Colb expanded on the differences between the prior art of the record and what the applicant is claiming in claim 1. Specifically that ones of the multiple aliases are used to identify the individual advertisers. Furthermore, it was discussed that each such alias is used for the purpose of payment to the advertiser. The examiner stated that the prior art of record does uses aliases but the purpose is to hide the merchant or originating product provider. The prior art of record does uses other means of identification such as "merchID", "payerID", and "resellerID" to identify the originating advertiser in order to make payments. Applicant should file an RCE to enter amendmant..